

## **REMARKS**

By the *Office Action* marked non-final of 23 August 2007, Claims 21-34 are pending in the Application, with Claims 21-34 being rejected. Applicant and Applicant's counsel thank the Examiner with appreciation for the careful examination. No new matter is believed introduced by this submission.

Applicant files this *Response to Office Action* solely to facilitate prosecution. As such, Applicant reserves the right to pursue claims of broader or similar scope as originally filed in a continuation application or other application after allowance of the present application. Applicant does not concede that the current or past rejections are correct and reserve the right to challenge such rejections later in prosecution or on appeal. Accordingly, any amendment, argument, or claim cancellation is not to be construed as abandonment or disclaimer of subject matter.

After entry of this *Response to Office Action*, Claims 21-34 are pending. Applicant respectfully asserts that the pending claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in light of the following remarks.

### **I. Rejection Of Claims 21-34 Under 35 USC § 102**

The Examiner rejects Claims 21-34 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,731,625 to Eastep ("Eastep"). Applicant respectfully traverses.

In Claim 21, the method requires "obtaining a first, transient identifier associated with a communication session of said user over an anonymous network" (for example an IP address which is provided by the network access provider for the specific session, wherein the user is essentially anonymous to the network). In contrast in Eastep the user connects with a specific caller ID (e.g. the users telephone number), which is a unique identifier and not transient. See for example Col. 22 lines 63-65, as quoted by the Examiner, which states that the agent gathers the telephone number of the calling party. Thus, the identifier in Eastep is not transient and the network is not anonymous as required by Applicant's Claim 21.

Claim 25 includes the limitation "obtaining by a network device an identifier associated with a telephone line accessing a data network" (for example determining the identity of the telephone line used by the user to access the Internet). Applicant has not found such a limitation in Eastep and the Examiner has not shown that Eastep teaches such a limitation.

Claim 26 includes the limitation "reporting said user as an adult if said account details pertain only to users above a predetermined age". Applicant has not found such a limitation in Eastep and the Examiner has not shown that Eastep teaches such a limitation.

Claim 29 includes the limitation "Obtaining an identifier of a telephone line connecting a user to a data network from a network side of a connection between said user and said data network". Col. 101 lines 1-38 in Eastep quoted by the Examiner teaches identifying the computer or the user, but not the telephone line as required by Applicant's Claim 29.

Claim 32 includes the limitation "an extraction unit able to extract an identifier of a telephone line connecting a user to a data network from a network side of a connection between said user and said network". Similar to Claim 29 applicant has not found the suggestion of such a limitation in Eastep and the Examiner has not shown that Eastep teaches such a limitation.

Anticipation of a claim requires that the reference must teach all the limitations of the claim and Eastep lacks one or more of the limitations from each of the independent claims, therefore Eastep does not anticipate the claims. Accordingly, independent Claims 21, 25, 26, 29, and 32 are allowable, and all claims depending from these independent claims, Claims 22-24, 27-28, 30-31, and 33-34, are also allowable.

## **II. Fees**

This *Response to Office Action* is being filed within six months of the *Office Action*. Applicant notes that as the six-month date, 23 February 2008, fell on a Saturday, Applicant's filing on 25 February 2008 is within six months of the *Office Action*. Therefore, other than the three-month petition for extension of time, for which a petition for extension of time has been filed herewith, no other fees are believed due. If any additional fee is due, please charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1507.

## CONCLUSION

By the present *Response to Restriction Requirement Office Action*, Claims 21-34 have been in placed in full condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests early and favorable action. Should the Examiner have any further questions or reservations, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned Attorney at 404.885.3695.

Respectfully submitted,

**Certificate of Transmission:**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted by e-filing to the US Patent and Trademark Office in accordance with §1.8 on this date via the EFS-Web electronic filing system.

/Trenton A. Ward, Reg. #59157/

/Trenton A. Ward, Reg. #59157/

25 February 2008

Trenton A. Ward.  
Registration No. 59,157

Troutman Sanders LLP  
Bank of America Plaza  
600 Peachtree Street, N.E., Suite 5200  
Atlanta, Georgia 30308-2216  
United States  
Phone: 404.885.3695  
Fax: 404.962.6818